

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated September 22, 2006. Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1-30 are rejected. Claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 13, 14, 18, 21, 25, and 26 have been amended and claims 4-5, 8, 10, 16-17, 20, and 22 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 6-7, 9, 12-15, 18-19, 21, and 23-30 remain pending in the present application.

The specification has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 13, 14, 18, 21, 25, and 26 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner to overcome to claim objections and §112 rejections. This amendment is seen by Applicant as broadening or cosmetic, and as such, is not subject to the prosecution history estoppel imposed by Festo. For the record, Applicant points out that the Supreme Court in Festo noted that a cosmetic amendment would not narrow the patent's scope and thus would not raise the estoppel bar.

Independent claims 1, 13, and 25 have been further amended to recite that the adapter API is native to the client applications. Support for this amendment may be found in the Specification on page 13, lines 21-23 through page 14, line 3; and page 16, line 17-19, for example. Dependent claims 2 and 14 have been amended to recite that the adapter API includes a second set of methods that "provides consumption logic and methods for automatically exporting data defined in a Web-based schema registry, from the database into the client applications using Web services." Support for this amendment may be found in the Specification on page 18, lines 19 through page 14+; page 10, lines 21-23, and page 13, line 21 through page 14, lines 1-3, for example.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 6, 10, 13-15, 18 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645). The

Examiner rejected claims 8 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma. The Examiner rejected claims 4, 9, 16, 21 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Fry (U.S. Patent No. 6,880,125). The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Glass and Umar (both articles). The Examiner rejected claims 7, 11, 12, 19, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Chiang et al. (US 6,948,174). The Examiner rejected claims 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Fry, and further in view of Chiang. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Sharma provides an ability to package a service using a servlet component model, whereas the claims of the present application relate to systems and methods for automatically registering data sources with a schema registry using a web based interface, generating DTDs based on the registered data sources, and providing adapter API's native to the client applications (e.g., for supported languages and platforms), that include reader and writer APIs for submitting and exporting data between the client applications.

It is believed Sharma, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest "providing an adapter API native to the client applications," as recited in claims 1, 13 and 25. Instead, the API referred in Sharma's filing is limited to Java language, whereas the claimed adapter API is language independent, allowing for a more heterogeneous system. It is also believed that Sharma, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest "including a second set of methods in the adapter API for the client applications that provides consumption logic and methods for automatically exporting data defined in a Web-based schema registry, from the database into the client applications using Web services."

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-3, 6-7, 9, 12-15, 18-19, 21, and 23-30 are allowable over the cited references. Because the secondary references stand or

fall with the primary references, claims are allowable because they are dependent upon the allowable independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and passage to issue of claims 1-3, 6-7, 9, 12-15, 18-19, 21, and 23-30 as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile or electronically transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below

Date: January 22, 2007

Signature: /Stephen G. Sullivan/  
Typed Name: Stephen G. Sullivan

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen G. Sullivan/  
Stephen G. Sullivan  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 38329  
Telephone No.: 650 969-7474

Date: January 22, 2007